Attitudes and attitude change:

Implications for the OSSIS Speakers Bureau Programme

Megan M. Thompson

Donald R. McCreary

Defence R&D Canada – Toronto

Technical Memorandum

DRDC Toronto TM 2003 – 126

September 2003

Author

Megan M. Thompson

Approved by

R. Pigeau
Head, Command Effectiveness and Behaviour Section

Approved for release by

K.M. Sutton
Chair, Document Review and Library Committee

© Her Majesty the Queen as represented by the Minister of National Defence, 2003
© Sa majesté la reine, représentée par le ministre de la Défense nationale, 2003

104-05661/

Abstract

The Operational Stress Injury Social Support (OSISS) project is developing a Speakers Bureau in order to educate and increase awareness of occupational stress injuries (OSIs). Specifically, the Speakers Bureau will be a cadre of respected CF members, trained to speak to small groups of CF personnel about their own experience of OSIs. By combining scientific information and data with personal accounts of their own OSIs, it is hoped that these speakers will put a more human or personal face on operational stress injuries, thus reducing the stigma of these occupationally-related mental health problems. The ultimate goal of the OSISS Speakers Bureau is to provide education in the larger CF community in order to foster understanding and acceptance of operational stress injuries (OSIs). In order to assist OSISS in this endeavor, this report reviews the main theories and key research findings from the attitude and attitude change literature. We provide applications of key concepts to OSIs, and OSI-related attitude change, thereby linking theory and research to this important area. We also discuss the attitude-behavior relation, as well as major factors that can facilitate or obstruct sustained attitude change in general, and with respect to mental health issues more specifically. We then place attitudes and attitude change within the larger cultural context of the CF. We conclude by summarizing key findings and providing recommendations to guide the OSISS program's development of a Speakers Bureau.

Résumé

Le projet Soutien social aux victimes de stress opérationnel (SSVSO) est en train de mettre sur pied un bureau des conférenciers qui sera chargé d'éduquer et de sensibiliser les militaires aux traumatismes liés au stress opérationnel (TSO). Plus précisément, le bureau des conférenciers sera composé de membres respectés des FC, formés pour parler devant de petits groupes de militaires canadiens concernant leur expérience des TSO. En combinant l'information et les données scientifiques avec les récits personnels de TSO, nous espérons que ces conférenciers traceront un portrait plus humain ou personnel des traumatismes liés au stress opérationnel, en vue de réduire la honte associée à ce type de problèmes de santé mentale d'origine professionnelle. L'objectif ultime du bureau des conférenciers du SSVSO est d'informer la communauté plus large des FC afin qu'elle comprenne et accepte mieux les traumatismes liés au stress opérationnel (TSO). Dans le but d'aider le projet SSVSO dans cette entreprise, nous passons en revue dans le présent rapport les principales théories et conclusions de recherche tirées des études publiées sur l'attitude et le changement d'attitude. Nous appliquons les concepts clés aux TSO et au changement d'attitude à l'égard des TSO, établissant ainsi un lien entre la théorie et la recherche dans cet important domaine. Nous discutons également de la relation attitude-comportement de même que des principaux facteurs qui peuvent faciliter ou entraver un changement durable d'attitude en général et d'attitude face aux problèmes de santé mentale en particulier. Nous replaçons ensuite les attitudes et le changement d'attitude dans le contexte culturel plus large des FC. Nous concluons en résumant les principales observations et formulons des recommandations pour orienter la mise sur pied du bureau des conférenciers par le programme de SSVSO.

Executive summary

1. The Operational Stress Injury Social Support (OSISS) project is developing a Speakers Bureau in order to educate and increase awareness of Canadian Forces (CF) personnel concerning occupational stress injuries (OSIs). The Speakers Bureau will be a cadre of respected CF members, trained to speak to small groups of CF personnel about OSIs. By combining scientific information and data with personal accounts of their own OSIs, it is hoped that these speakers will put a more human or personal face on operational stress injuries, thus reducing the stigma of these occupationally-related mental health problems. The ultimate goal of the OSISS Speakers Bureau is to provide education in the larger CF community in order to foster understanding and acceptance of operational stress injuries (OSIs).

2. This report reviews the key theories and research findings from the attitude and attitude change literature in order to assist OSISS in developing the Speakers Bureau. We provide applications of key attitude concepts to OSIs, and OSI-related attitude change, thereby linking theory and research to this important area. We also discuss major factors that can facilitate or obstruct sustained attitude change in general, and with respect to mental health issues more specifically.

3. Attitudes concerning OSIs are likely to reflect a number of attitude functions, including soldiers' core beliefs concerning the CF culture of strength and toughness. These attitudes may also be complex in nature; that is people may have both positive and negative beliefs, and/or both positive and negative feelings underlying their attitudes about OSIs. These beliefs and their accompanying emotions mean that the attitudes the OSISS Speakers Bureau is setting about to change may be strongly entrenched and emotionally charged. It is vital, therefore, to understand the function, structure and strength of the attitudes to be influenced. Thus, the Speakers Bureau should design their presentation to address the particular functions, and to target the relevant beliefs and feelings underlying the attitude to be changed.

4. The major theory addressing attitude change is the Elaboration Likelihood Model. The ELM describes two major mechanisms underlying the way people process persuasive messages (e.g., a talk given by a member of the OSSIS Speakers Bureau). One route is the central processing routes of persuasion, and emphasises the quality of the arguments presented, encouraging the audience to think more deeply about an issue, and generally leads to longer-term attitude change. Peripheral routes of attitude change include contextual cues unrelated to the argument including aspects of the speaker: likability, credibility, similarity to the audience, professionalism, use of language (e.g., moderate speech pace, use of 'powerful phrasing'). To have the widest impact on the largest audience, persuasion attempts should focus on both central processing cues (i.e., the quality of arguments) and peripheral cues (i.e., the more stylistic aspects of the presentation and presenter).

5. The presentation must include evidence from credible sources (e.g., scientific publication, or unbiased organization). Presentation of evidence enhances both central and peripheral processing.

6. Personal accounts are also extremely effective means of attitude change. They tend to be perceived as vivid, they tend to elicit an emotional reaction, and have been shown to produce a strong effect on people's attitudes. However, it is extremely important that the target audience perceives the speaker as credible and legitimate.

7. Given the complex nature of OSI-related attitudes, the use of two-sided messages (acknowledging and then refuting negative attitudes about OSIs) will be more likely to promote attitude change. Fear appeals and protest strategies that focus only on negative messages should be avoided.

8. The speaker should summarize his or her arguments at the end of the communication and clearly state in the conclusion the attitude that he or she would like the audience members to adopt. This would especially be true in the case of presentations that discuss both sides of the issues on OSIs.

9. The speakers who will produce the greatest amount of attitude change will be those who mildly disconfirm prevailing attitudes about OSIs.

10. Because the audience will have a large number of experienced soldiers who have deployed, it is imperative that the OSI Speakers Bureau be comprised of individuals who have at least equal, credible operational experience. Personnel who do not have sufficient operational experience should not convey these messages as they can be discounted due to their lack of operational experience for an audience of combat soldiers.

11. As noted, attitudes toward military personnel with operational stress injuries are likely to be strongly held and emotionally charged. Relatively new attitude change techniques involve a two-stage process that first targets important motivational aspects of the audience prior to the presentation of information that is at odds with the initial audience attitude. These techniques include empathy-inducing instructions, priming of value inconsistencies relevant to the attitude to be changed and self-affirmation techniques. Although research results are quite encouraging, note that additional research needs to be conducted to determine the effectiveness of such techniques in the context of military personnel, and the effectiveness of the techniques with respect to longer term attitude change, as well as behavior change.

12. Simply changing people's attitudes will not *automatically* result in behaviour change. The relation context is the influence of subjective norms, that is soldiers perceptions about how they think valued others in their social group want them to behave.

13. Long-term attitude change concerning OSIs must be considered in the context of the CF culture. Thus, attitudes toward OSIs will have to be reconciled with central core values of toughness and fitness within the CF.

14. Given the strong influence of social factor and group factors in a military culture, the efforts of the OSISS Speakers Bureau must be presented in the context between attitudes and behaviours involves multiple factors. Particularly relevant in the present of an integrated approach to OSI attitude and behaviour change. Policies should be designed with zero tolerance for overt prejudice and stereotypes. Even more importantly, the tacit attitudes and behaviours of CF commander structures must support OSI attitude and behaviour change.

Thompson, M.M, & McCreary, D.R. 2003. Attitude and Attitude Change: Implications for the OSSIS Speakers Bureau Programme. TM 2003-126 Defence R&D Canada – Toronto.

Sommaire

1. Le projet de Soutien social aux victimes de stress opérationnel (SSVSO) est en train de mettre sur pied un bureau des conférenciers qui sera chargé d'éduquer et de sensibiliser les militaires aux traumatismes liés au stress opérationnel (TSO). Plus précisément, le bureau des conférenciers sera composé de membres respectés des FC, formés pour parler devant de petits groupes de militaires canadiens concernant leur expérience des TSO. En combinant l'information et les données scientifiques avec les récits personnels de TSO, nous espérons que ces conférenciers traceront un portrait plus humain ou personnel des traumatismes liés au stress opérationnel, en vue de réduire la honte associée à ce type de problèmes de santé mentale d'origine professionnelle. L'objectif ultime du bureau des conférenciers du SSVSO est d'informer la communauté plus large des FC afin qu'elle comprenne et accepte mieux les traumatismes liés au stress opérationnel (TSO).

2. Dans le but d'aider le projet SSVSO dans cette entreprise, nous passons en revue dans le présent rapport les principales théories et conclusions de recherche tirées des études publiées sur l'attitude et le changement d'attitude. Nous appliquons les concepts clés aux TSO et au changement d'attitude à l'égard des TSO, établissant ainsi un lien entre la théorie et la recherche dans cet important domaine. Nous discutons également de la relation attitude-comportement de même que des principaux facteurs qui peuvent faciliter ou entraver un changement durable d'attitude en général et d'attitude face aux problèmes de santé mentale en particulier.

3. Les attitudes à l'égard des TSO reflètent probablement les fonctions attitudinales, notamment l'adhérence fondamentale des soldats à la culture des FC qui valorise la force et la solidité. Ces attitudes peuvent également être très complexes; autrement dit, les personnes peuvent avoir des croyances à la fois positives et négatives ou des émotions positives et négatives qui sous-tendent leurs attitudes concernant les TSO. À cause de ces croyances et des émotions concomitantes, les attitudes que le bureau des conférenciers du SSVSO cherche à modifier peuvent être fortement enracinées et chargées d'émotions. Il est ainsi essentiel de comprendre la fonction, la structure et la fermeté de ces attitudes sur lesquelles on veut agir. Le bureau des conférenciers devrait ainsi élaborer son exposé de façon à traiter des fonctions particulières et de cibler les croyances et les émotions pertinentes sous-tendant l'attitude à modifier.

4. La principale théorie portant sur le changement d'attitude est le modèle de probabilité d'intégration de l'information (Elaboration Likelihood Model). Le modèle ELM décrit deux principaux mécanismes sous-tendant la façon dont les personnes intègrent les messages persuasifs (p. ex. un exposé donné par un membre du bureau des conférenciers du SSVSO). Un des modes emprunte les chemins centraux de la persuasion, met l'accent sur la qualité des arguments présentés, en invitant l'auditoire à une réflexion plus profonde sur une question et mène généralement à un changement d'attitude plus durable. Au nombre des chemins périphériques du changement d'attitude figurent les indices contextuels non liés à l'argument, notamment les caractéristiques du conférencier : amabilité, crédibilité, similitude à

l'auditoire, professionnalisme, utilisation de la langue (p. ex. rythme d'élocution modéré, utilisation d'expressions « puissantes »).

5. Pour avoir le plus d'impact sur l'auditoire le plus nombreux, les tentatives de persuasion devraient insister sur les indices centraux (p. ex. la qualité des arguments) et les indices périphériques (p. ex. des aspects plus stylistiques de l'exposé et du conférencier).

6. L'exposé doit comporter la présentation de données provenant de sources crédibles (p. ex. publication scientifique ou organisation impartiale). La présentation de données améliore le traitement central et périphérique de l'information.

7. Les anecdotes personnelles sont également des moyens extrêmement efficaces de modifier les attitudes. Elles sont perçues en général comme vivantes et tendent à susciter une réaction émotive et il a été démontré qu'elles exerçaient un effet puissant sur les attitudes. Il est cependant très important que le public cible perçoive le conférencier comme un interlocuteur crédible et légitime.

8. Dans le cas des TSO, l'utilisation de messages qui montrent les deux côtés (reconnaissance puis réfutation des attitudes négatives concernant les TSO) auront plus de chances de promouvoir un changement attitudinal. Il faut éviter les appels à la peur et les stratégies de protestation qui mettent l'accent uniquement sur les messages négatifs.

9. Le conférencier devrait résumer ses arguments à la fin de la communication et énoncer clairement dans sa conclusion l'attitude qu'il voudrait que les membres de l'auditoire adoptent. C'est particulièrement le cas pour les exposés qui abordent les deux côtés d'une question relative aux TSO.

10. Les conférenciers qui obtiendront le plus grand changement d'attitude seront ceux qui réfutent avec modération les attitudes existantes à l'égard des TSO.

11. Comme nous l'avons mentionné, les attitudes envers les militaires victimes de stress opérationnel risquent d'être bien enracinées et chargées d'émotion. Des techniques relativement nouvelles de modification des attitudes comportent un processus en deux étapes qui cible d'abord les aspects motivationnels importants de l'auditoire avant la présentation d'informations qui ne concordent pas avec l'attitude initiale de celui-ci. Au nombre de ces techniques figurent les instructions génératrices d'empathie, la mise en évidence des incohérences dans les valeurs liées à l'attitude à modifier et les techniques d'auto-affirmation. Bien que les résultats de recherche soient assez encourageants, d'autres recherches s'imposent pour déterminer l'efficacité de ces techniques dans le cas du personnel militaire et sur le plan de la modification des attitudes et du comportement à plus long terme.

12. Le fait simplement de modifier les attitudes des personnes n'entraînera pas *automatiquement* un changement de comportement. La relation entre les attitudes et les comportements est tributaire de multiples facteurs. Un des facteurs particulièrement pertinents en l'occurrence est l'influence des normes subjectives,

c'est-à-dire les perceptions qu'ont les soldats du type de comportement que les personnes qu'ils valorisent dans leur groupe social voudraient qu'ils adoptent.

13. Le changement attitudinal durable face aux TSO doit être replacé dans le contexte de la culture des FC. Il faudra ainsi concilier les attitudes à l'égard des TSO avec les valeurs centrales de solidité et d'aptitude physique qui dominent dans les FC.

14. Compte tenu de la forte influence du facteur social et des facteurs liés au groupe dans une culture militaire, les efforts du bureau des conférenciers du SSVSO doivent être présentés dans le cadre d'une approche intégrée du changement d'attitude et de comportement vis-à-vis des TSO. Les politiques devraient être conçues de façon à ne tolérer aucun préjugé ni stéréotype manifeste. Et chose encore plus importante, les attitudes et comportements tacites des structures de commandement des FC doivent appuyer le changement d'attitude et de comportement vis-à-vis des TSO.

Thompson, M.M, & McCreary, D.R. 2003. Attitude and Attitude Change: Implications for the OSSIS Speakers Bureau Programme. TM 2003-126 Defence R&D Canada – Toronto.

Table of contents

Abstract i

Résumé ii

Executive summary iii

Sommaire vi

Table of contents ix

Background 1

What is an attitude? 1

Attitude functions 2

Attitude structure 3

Attitude strength 4

Attitude change: The Elaboration Likelihood Model 4

Central route to persuasion 4

Peripheral route to persuasion 5

Increasing the likelihood of elaboration: Message factors 6

Message construction 6

Message content 7

Language 8

An empirical comparison of three types of attitude change appeals 9

Increasing the likelihood of elaboration: Audience factors 9

Motivation 9

Ability 10

Prior attitudes 10

Attitudes and behaviour 12

Causes of prejudiced attitudes 12

Attitudes and attitude change in the larger context 13

Summary & recommendations 15

References 17

Background

On October 16, 2002, the Department of National Defence Armed Forces Council reconfirmed the Mission and Mandate for the Canadian Forces Operational Stress Injury and Support (OSSIS) program. Part of their Mission Statement requires OSSIS to "... provide education and training in the CF community to create an understanding and acceptance of operational stress injuries (OSIs)." To fulfil this goal, OSSIS is mandated to develop and validate "the methodology required to effect cultural change regarding the realities of operational stress injuries" (OSSIS Mandate, 2002).

Members of the OSSIS team have chosen a Speakers Bureau method in order to educate and increase awareness of occupational stress injuries (e.g., posttraumatic stress disorder, generalized anxiety, depression) in the CF. In the Speakers Bureau, a cadre of respected CF members will be trained to speak to small groups of CF personnel about OSIs. By combining scientific information and data with personal accounts of their own OSIs, it is hoped that these speakers will put a more human or personal face on operational stress injuries, in hopes of reducing the stigma of these occupationally-related mental health problems.

However, changing attitudes (either individual attitudes or cultural-level attitudes) about mental illness is not going to be an easy task. Members of the military share the general public's lack of knowledge, suspicion and fear about mental illnesses. Nonetheless, the route to changing these attitudes, whether within the military, or at a broader societal level, lies in an integrated approach, of which a Speaker's Bureau forms one element. Also necessary is a thorough understanding of the attitude concept in general, factors affecting attitude change, and how these concepts might apply in the case of OSIs.

Social psychologists have been studying attitudes and attitude change for almost a century and have noted that, while attitudes can be changed, the process is often difficult and lengthy. We outline the main theories and key research findings from this large literature in this report. We also provide applications of key concepts to OSIs, and OSI-related attitude change, thereby linking theory and research to this important area. Our hope is that this information will provide the members of the OSSIS team with a realistic set of expectations, as well as a guide to the most effective ways for changing CF members' attitudes about operational stress injuries.

What is an attitude?

An attitude can be defined as "a learned, global evaluation of an object (person, place, or issue) that influences thought and action" [1; p. 39] [2]. Attitudes are learned because people are not born with them; rather, they learn them from their parents, peers, community, and culture. Attitudes are evaluative because there is an affective (or emotional) component to them: people's attitudes are typically positive, negative, or ambivalent (i.e., conflicted). Finally, attitudes can influence behaviour by steering people towards or away from certain situations (e.g., someone with positive attitudes towards a mental illness is more likely to arrange a meeting with a psychotherapist).

Attitude functions

People hold attitudes because they serve a variety of important functions [3] [4]. Attitudes serve as knowledge, and this can be especially important in the face of ambiguous or puzzling occurrences. This *knowledge function* of attitudes helps us make sense of the world around us. For instance, soldiers can feel they understand OSIs if they believe that they happen only to people who have had previous problems, and thus feel that they can predict what will cause OSI's to occur. Understanding the causes and the ability to predict provide people with a sense of control over events, and also imbue events with an overarching meaning.

Holding or expressing the right attitudes also helps us obtain rewards and avoid punishments, thereby serving an *instrumental function*. For instance, some soldiers could hold negative attitudes about OSIs if they believe these reflect the attitudes of their leaders and may perceive that holding similar attitudes will favourably influence future promotion. Particular attitudes also serve *social acceptance functions*, allowing people better or easier entrée into their group. In this case "[p]eople sometimes adopt attitudes, not because they truly agree with the advocated position, but because they believe they will be more accepted by others if they take this side..." [1; p. 75]. Somewhat similarly, people also will hold particular attitudes in order to communicate their *social identity* (i.e., who they are). Attitudes also express core values, personal creeds and central convictions (also known as the *value expressive function*). Finally, attitudes may serve *ego defensive functions*. In this case, a soldier who believed that only inherently weak people succumb to OSIs is protected from feelings of personal vulnerability with respect to OSIs. As should be clear from the above examples, people can hold an attitude for a variety of reasons. Thus, different soldiers can hold negative attitude about OSIs because it helps them make sense about people who succumb to OSIs, to fit in with their social group, to express core beliefs about strength and toughness, or to avoid feelings of personal vulnerability.

Although the previous discussion may seem to be more appropriate to a textbook than the real world, understanding an attitude's function or functions allows more focused attempts to change attitudes. Moreover, these attitude change or persuasion attempts are more likely to succeed with a thorough understanding of the reason or reasons an audience holds a particular attitude. For example, attitudes that serve social acceptance and/or instrumental functions may be more amenable to change if prevailing social pressures change than if OSI- related negative attitudes are rooted in value expressive or ego defensive functions. Understanding and accessing core values and beliefs and showing that these values are inconsistent with an OSI-related negative attitude is also a means in which to effect attitude change. For example, one could contrast the strongly held military value of not leaving injured colleagues behind, with many soldiers' attitudes and behaviors toward colleagues who have developed OSIs.

Attitude structure

To understand attitudes, and how to change them, one must also understand their structure. The most widely held theory about the structure of attitudes is called the *Expectancy-Value Model* [5]. This model suggests that there are two components to an attitude: beliefs and feelings (the latter are also called evaluations). Both need to be understood in order to understand, and thus change, attitudes. For instance, within an overall attitude, there are a certain number of beliefs. Each of those beliefs has a feeling or evaluation associated with it. Some beliefs may be positive, while some may be negative. In addition, the affective connotations for these beliefs will likely vary across people (e.g., Soldier A may have a negative feeling associated with Belief 1, while Soldier B may have a negative feeling associated with the same Belief. Soldier C may share the same belief but have conflicted feelings about the Belief 1). This reflects the complex nature of an attitude. To determine whether the overall attitude is positive or negative, [5]multiply each belief a person has concerning an issue by its correspondent feeling or evaluation. Then the sum of all of the belief by evaluation components is taken.

Applying these notions to the present issue then, Soldier A's overall attitude about OSIs will be determined by the number of beliefs he or she has (e.g., Belief 1: "People with OSIs receive special treatment. Belief 2: "People with OSIs are different from most soldiers"), combined with the feelings or evaluations for those beliefs (e.g., Feeling 1: "People with OSIs get an *unfair* amount of attention and breaks from the system" Belief 2: "People with OSIs are *weaker* than most soldiers"). Soldier B may share the same belief that people with OSIs receive special treatment, but may also feel OSIs *deserve* any additional treatment they receive. Similarly, Soldier B may also believe that people with OSIs are different from 'normal' soldiers, but feel that it is entirely due to the overwhelming *situations* they faced while on deployment, rather than due to any inherent personal deficiency. Again the underlying structure of an audience's attitude is important to consider in order to better shape effective persuasion attempts. For instance, if the audience has mainly negative feelings about OSIs, then persuasion attempts that only address changing the beliefs, but not the feelings associated with those beliefs, will be less effective.

We also mentioned that a third soldier might have conflicted attitudes about OSIs. When this happens, attitude researchers say this person is *ambivalent* [e.g., 6] There are two situations that typically signal attitudinal ambivalence. First, there can be situations where people hold incompatible beliefs. Using our previous examples, a soldier can believe that someone with an OSI receives special treatment; however, that same person also can believe that someone with an OSI is no different from other soldiers. A second common situation that may lead to ambivalence is when there is a discrepancy between the way one thinks about an attitude and the way one feels about the same attitude (i.e., head vs. heart). Here a soldier may believe that people with OSIs will recover with treatment, but feel nonetheless that they get too many breaks from the system. Conflicted or ambivalent attitudes are important to consider because they may change more easily from negative to positive (and back to negative again) based on situational or contextual factors, and are less likely to be acted upon [7] [8].

Attitude strength

Not all attitudes are created equal. That is, some attitudes are stronger than others. Attitude strength is important to consider because, according to Krosnick and Petty [9], strong attitudes are more likely to persist over time, affect people's judgments, guide people's behaviour, and be more resistant to change. How can one tell whether one is assessing a stronger (as opposed to weaker) attitude? Perloff [1] describes several characteristics of a strong attitude: (1) attitudes that are linked with or reflect *core values* within ourselves are more likely to be strong; (2) attitudes that are *important* to us are more likely to be strong; (3) *extreme* attitudes are more likely to be strong; (4) when we are convinced that our attitude on a given topic is the *correct* attitude (e.g., supported by scientific data, or is the prevailing attitude in a culture), the attitude is more likely to be strong; (5) attitudes that are *accessible* (i.e., come quickly to mind; we don't have to think to hard about them) are more likely to be strong; and (6) topics about which we *know a lot* are more likely to have strong attitudes associated with them.

In general then, when changing attitudes, it is imperative to understand the underlying composition of attitudes, as they may be quite complex. Therefore, one does not only want to change the beliefs within the attitude (e.g., by adding new beliefs or information in support of the idea one is attempting to persuade people to accept), but also change the feelings associated with the beliefs. One also needs to understand the functions the attitude may hold for a target audience. Finally, strong beliefs will likely be most resistant to change.

Attitude change: The Elaboration Likelihood Model

How does one go about changing attitudes? The most commonly studied, current theory of attitude change is the *Elaboration Likelihood Model* (ELM) [10] [11] [12] [11]. Given its name, it is not surprising that the main component of the ELM is elaboration. Elaboration refers to the degree to which people think about an argument. For persuasion to occur, one must increase the likelihood of elaboration. The ELM states that, in order to understand how one can change an attitude, one has to understand the mechanisms underlying the way people process persuasive messages (e.g., a talk given by a member of the OSSIS Speakers Bureau). The ELM describes two routes by which information (such as a persuasive argument) travel when being processed by people: central and peripheral processing routes

Central route to persuasion

The *central processing route* is the method whereby elaboration is most likely to take place. People who are processing information along the central route identify the central features of the argument and think deeply about its meaning, impact or implications, and then often bring in other related information that they already have at hand [12]. This type of central processing often can cause attitudes to change. At other times, message elaboration of arguments can lead audiences to become more entrenched in their original views, for many reasons. This can happen when the audience member's initial attitudes are strongly against those presented in the

persuasive message (we say more about this later). This can also happen when an attitude one is attempting to change reflects a person's core values. In the end, an audience member may or may not agree with the persuasive message, but if it is thoughtfully put together, they will give it a lot of thought in order to reach their decision either to keep their attitude intact or change it.

Peripheral route to persuasion

The second route by which people process persuasive messages is referred to as the *peripheral route*. When processing information by the peripheral route, people either process the content of the persuasive argument quickly (i.e., they do not elaborate on it) or use contextual cues unrelated to the argument in order to determine whether or not they accept the argument. In other words, they rely on simple decision rules [13]. For example, people may base their decision to accept the persuasive message on the number of arguments presented (irrespective or whether they are good arguments), or on the attractiveness, credibility, or authority of the person giving the information. People also may be influenced by situational cues from the environment (e.g., music, size of group, colours in the presentational material), or the persuasive message may be overly simplistic and not warrant elaboration. Either way, when people process the message along the peripheral route, they do not elaborate on the message content, but are influenced by non-message-related cues.

Perloff [1] notes that peripheral factors often have a large influence on whether or not a persuasive message is accepted. Managing peripheral cues is relatively easy. For instance, the presenter should dress appropriately, use terms familiar to the audience, and avoid emotionally charged words. The presentation should be well organized and look professional. Every attempt should be made to add authority and credibility cues—such as rank and credible operational experience—to the presenter. On the other hand, getting people to elaborate upon a persuasive argument is difficult and often out of the persuader's control.

Given the relative ease of managing peripheral cues, especially in relation to the difficulty of getting people to elaborate upon an argument, should persuasion attempts rely more on peripheral cues than on getting people to elaborate on their argument? The answer to that question is no. In some situations, attitude change will be more likely to occur only when the message is elaborated upon (e.g., strongly held attitudes, complicated messages). Furthermore, not everyone in the audience will process the information in the same way (i.e., some people will elaborate the message, others will reply on peripheral cues).

Perhaps most importantly to the present application of this work to the OSISS Speaker's Bureau programme, an abundance of research indicates that attitudes changed through elaboration are more resistant to future change [i.e., 14]. As Eagly and Chaiken [12] note, "Central route persuasion produces attitudes that are more persistent, predictive of behaviour, and more resistant to counterpropaganda than attitudes formed or changed via peripheral mechanisms (p. 318). Thus, the person attempting to persuade others needs to consider a multifaceted approach to attitude change. They need to provide the appropriate peripheral cues but encourage

elaboration, especially if the attitudes they are attempting to change are strongly held by many audience members [e.g., 11], as is likely in the case of OSIs.

Increasing the likelihood of elaboration: Message factors

One of the most important aspects associated with increasing the likelihood that a persuasive communication will be processed centrally is the message itself. That is, the message needs to be crafted in such a way that increases the probability of elaboration. Attitude change researchers have focussed on three aspects of message construction: message structure, message content, and the language within the message.

Message construction

Three important aspects of how a message is constructed need to be considered. The first is *message sidedness*. That is, do you present only your side of the issue or argument, or do you present a more balanced approach? Some people might argue that, by presenting a balanced approach, a person is giving time to the opposing side and may decrease the saliency of his or her argument. However, presenting only one side of an argument may make the speaker seem biased in the eyes of the audience members. So, which viewpoint is right? The answer, as supported by several studies as well as theoretical and empirical reviews (meta analyses), is that two-sided messages are more persuasive, but only if the message refutes the opposing argument [15] [16].

In other words, just mentioning the other argument doesn't work; the persuader has to actively refute the opposition by providing strong evidence and arguments against it. The reasons two-sided communications are effective are that they are often well thought out (i.e., strong arguments promote elaboration) and increase the credibility of the speaker (i.e., increasing the saliency of a peripheral cue for those not elaborating the message). It also makes audience members more resistant to changing their attitudes later on. McGuire [17] refers to this approach as attitude inoculation. Moreover he notes, two-sided appeals are less likely to be perceived by an audience as a blatant attempt at attitude change. This too is important because blatant attempts to change people's attitudes are often perceived as coercive and set up psychological reactance in audience members, and may even cause them to become more entrenched or extreme in their pre-existing attitudes. Finally, research shows that two-sided appeals are particularly effective when the attitude in question is a 'cultural truism', that is an attitude or belief that is unquestionably accepted as true by most members of a society. Undoubtedly many of the attitudes associated with OSIs fall into the cultural truism category.

A second aspect of message construction that is important to consider is *conclusion drawing*. Should a speaker summarize his or her arguments at the end of the communication and clearly state in the conclusion the attitude that he or she would like the audience to adopt? Or should the speaker provide the persuasive message and then let the audience form their own conclusion about the attitude change message?

The answer to this question can be summed up by a 'tongue in cheek' quote from McGuire [17], who noted "In communication, it appears, it is not sufficient to lead the horse to water; one must also push his head underneath to get him to drink" (p. 209). In other words, it is best for a speaker to make an explicit conclusion to his or her argument; this minimizes the chances that the audience members will be confused about where the speaker stands on the topic. This may be especially necessary in cases of two-sided appeals.

The third major aspect of message construction to be considered is *primacy versus recency*. In the context of the Speakers Bureau, should the speaker present information and arguments that support positive attitudes toward soldiers with OSIs before addressing attitudes that reject soldiers with OSIs? That is, does being the first position addressed (i.e., primacy) have an advantage in the persuasion process, or does the last position presented (i.e., recency) retain the better advantage? Unfortunately, there is no conclusive evidence supporting the supremacy of one over the other [1]. It appears that in some cases primacy is better (e.g., when the audience is highly involved), while in others recency is more important (e.g., if there is a long time between messages). But even these findings are not consistent because many contextual factors strongly influence this effect. Moreover, integrating this issue with the previous discussion of one versus two sided appeals, it is would usually be the case that it is better to present the negative attitudes and beliefs (say those associated with OSIs), refute them, and then present information consistent with positive attitudes.

Message content

The second message factor most commonly studied is message content. Three aspects of message content are important here, the first being the *use of evidence*. That is, does using evidence to support your claim make your message stronger and more likely to convince the audience? The answer appears to be an overwhelming yes. However, there are two important caveats: (1) the evidence must be from a credible source (e.g., scientific publication, prestigious or unbiased organization, see Reynolds & Reynolds [18]); and (2) the evidence must be reported in a way that people know it is being offered in support for the argument. While evidence can increase the likelihood that a message will be processed via the central route, some aspects of evidence (e.g., numerous statistics and facts) can be used as peripheral cues [1].

But what about using *personal stories* (i.e., the types of stories a member of the OSISS Speakers Bureau might consider telling) as a means of persuasion? Do they count as evidence? Research shows that case studies are perceived to be vivid and they tend to elicit an emotional reaction. These qualities have been shown to produce a strong effect on people's attitudes [19]. Thus, even though they are not as "scientific" as some types of evidence, as long as the source is credible and legitimate, they can be used as evidence to create attitude change. (Note, however, that there will be many audience members who will have their own personal examples, or who have heard of an account second or third-hand. This will influence their initial attitudes about OSIs and may reduce, although maybe not erase, the effects of the speaker's personal account.)

When creating message content, the persuader also should consider the effectiveness of using *fear*. For example, someone speaking on the need to have OSIs treated may tell an audience that failure to do so could lead to the disintegration of their family and to losing friends. This is a fear appeal, using someone's fear of losing something important to him or her in order to motivate that person to accept a specific message. But does fear work as a persuasive tool? The answer is yes … and no. Research has shown that, in order for fear to work, the right amount of fear has to be aroused. Too little fear and people will not pay attention to the persuasive message; too much fear and people will not pay attention either (although for different reasons than if there is too little fear). Finding the right "fear balance" is extremely laborious [20]. Given the difficulty involved in using fear in persuasion, it is our opinion that the OSSIS team should avoid using this in their Speakers Bureau messages.

Finally, how a persuasive message is *framed* can be important [21]. That is, does the speaker *gain-frame* their message (i.e., talk about the benefits of their argument to the well-being of the audience members, or the CF as a whole) or do they *loss-frame* their message (i.e., talk about how not accepting their message will lead to negative outcomes for the audience)? The research suggests that neither type of framing leads to more persuasive messages, but that gain-framing is more important in some situations, while loss-framing is more important in others. Apanovitch, McCarthy, and Salovey [22] note that in situations where outcomes are uncertain (e.g., experiencing an OSI), loss-framing the message *might* be more effective than gain-framing the message. On the other hand, gain-framed messages are more effective at persuasion when the outcome of an action is more certain.

Language

The third main area of how a persuasive message is constructed is language. One aspect of language that has been widely studied is that of a person's *speed of speech*. That is, do fast-talking people have an advantage over slower talkers (i.e., are slower talkers more likely to bore the audience?)? Speed of speech is an important consideration in two ways. First, if the audience cannot understand the speaker because he or she speaks too fast, then that impairs the audience's ability to process the message, reducing the likelihood of message elaboration. However, both fast talking and slow, monotonous talking can impair a speaker's credibility and social attractiveness, two peripheral cues that may influence persuasion [23]. The research shows that, while fast talking can get someone's attention, moderately-paced speakers are perceived to be more credible (i.e., intelligent, confident, and effective). However, the context is key: advertisers have used both fast speech, slow speech, and incomprehensible speech to sell products; when placed in the right context (i.e., product and environment within the commercial or ad), what would normally hinder persuasion can enhance it. However, from the perspective of the OSSIS Speakers Bureau, we recommend moderately-paced speech.

The second way in which language is important to the way the message is constructed and presented to the audience is the use *powerless and powerful speech phrasing* [24]. In essence, people employ powerless speech phrasing when they actively undercut their own authority or credibility. People can do this in several ways, such as

hesitating (e.g., "Uh" and "well, you know"), hedging (e.g., "sort of", "I guess"), using tags (i.e., declarations with a question at the end), and using disclaimers (e.g., "I'm not an expert, but"). Powerful speech is considered to be the absence of powerless speech. As expected, the use of powerless speech reduces the likelihood that a persuasive argument will be accepted because it is seen to reduce the credibility and expertise of the presenter. As such, OSSIS Speakers Bureau members should be trained to avoid the use powerless speech.

An empirical comparison of three types of attitude change appeals

One study with direct relevance to OSSIS's Mandate (2002) and the OSSIS Speakers Bureau was conducted by Corrigan et al. [25]. In their study, Corrigan et al. explored impact of three different types of attitude change message appeals on people's attitudes towards severe mental illness [25]. In one condition an educational approach was used, which replaced myths about mental illness with correct information. The second strategy used was contact. Here, the presenters discussed their own history with, and recovery from, mental illness. The presenters were open about their successes and their continued struggle with aspects of their illness. Thus, contact challenged the audiences' attitudes through direct interaction with people with mental illnesses who mildly disconfirmed the generally accepted stereotypes. The third strategy, termed protest, focused on injustices against people with mental illness. Results revealed that the education and the contact strategies of presentations produced the greatest amount of attitude change, at least among the university students who participated in this study. Applying these findings to the OSISS Speakers Bureau Programme suggests that education and contact strategies are the most recommended avenues to effect some degree of attitude change. Strategies to be avoided include protest and fear appeals (both of which focus almost exclusively on negative messages).

Increasing the likelihood of elaboration: Audience factors

If the goal of the attitude change process is to get people to elaborate on a persuasive message, then how does one go about maximizing the chances that the person being persuaded will actually use an elaboration process, as opposed to peripheral cues?

Motivation

One of the most important factors that influences the likelihood a message will be elaborated upon is *recipient motivation* [26]. That is, people who want to know more about a given topic are motivated to hear the message and are more likely to process it via the central route. Also, a person who is involved in the topic area, or for whom the topic has personal relevance, would be more motivated than someone who is not involved in the area. For example, someone who has a family member or a friend who has been affected by an OSI would be more motivated than someone who is less involved to process a message about OSIs via the central route.

A second motivational factor is the *need for cognition* [27]. This is a personality characteristic that describes a person who wants to understand the world in all its complexity. In general then, someone who is high in the need for cognition would be more motivated to elaborate upon the persuasive message than someone who, overall, is less concerned about understanding and learning, even if the issue of OSIs has less personal relevance to him or her. Thus, a person who is low in need for cognition will be more likely to be persuaded by the peripheral cues in the message, for instance physical characteristics or rank of the presenter, rather than the quality of the message presented. Because there will be no way to determine the level of the need for cognition in the OSISS Speaker's Bureau audience members, our recommendation is to ensure both the quality of arguments and the stylistic aspects of the presentation are both high.

Ability

A second audience factor that increases the likelihood that someone will think about the quality of the messages provided in a persuasive message (i.e., central route processing) is *ability*. When people think of ability, they often think of stable aspects like intelligence or aptitude. However, the ability to elaborate a message is influenced by several factors such as prior knowledge, and more transient factors such as attention. Level of attention can increase or decrease elaboration likelihood. A higher degree of attention on the message means the person will listen more intently, increasing his or her ability to think deeply about OSIs. Anything that competes with the person's attention will distract the individual, impairing his or her ability to think deeply about the subject matter. For example, if OSI messages are presented as, say, one table in a room full of varied messages, there will be many people and many things competing for the listener's attention, as can be the case on a general information or PD day. The extent to which the other people and activity in the room distract a person is negatively related to that person's ability to process a persuasive message in depth. Similarly, the extent to which audience members have other pressing concerns or deadlines reduces their likelihood of processing OSI messages.

Prior experience of the audience is a powerful determinant of the effects of message content on attitude change. Prior knowledge influences elaboration likelihood because, when people know a lot about a given topic, they are more likely to scrutinize the persuasive message closely. Moreover, knowledgeable people are more likely to be able to identify poor arguments.

Prior attitudes

Finally, but perhaps most importantly, the *initial attitude* of the audience is important to consider. The initial attitude can be based in direct experience, but in many cases initial attitudes can be influenced by indirect knowledge, hearsay, and rumour. There are several ways that audience members can deal with a message that differs from their own opinions. They change their attitude. They can try to make the speaker change his or her opinion or attitude. They can seek support for their original opinion by finding people who share their views. Lastly, they can derogate the speaker [28].

All things being equal, if the initial attitude of the audience is strongly held and extremely discrepant from that of the speaker, almost no attitude change will take place [29]. The greatest amount of attitude change will occur when the ini l attitudes of the audience members are moderately discrepant from the position of the speaker.

Attitudes that are emotionally-based, serving ego-protective functions, that are strongly held, and have support from the social group, will be among the attitudes that are most difficult to change. Unfortunately, this set of circumstances aptly describes the current challenge facing OSISS, and other directorates within the CF whose job it is to provide care for service members confronting mental health issues. Nonetheless, recent research does suggest that there may be ways to promote attitude change even in these difficult circumstances. Simply put, attitude change in these contexts involves a two-stage process in which the motivation of the audience is targeted prior to the presentation of information that is at odds with their initial attitudes (Zanna, M. P., personal communication, Sept 15, 2003). The thinking here is that certain techniques addressing aspects of audience motivation will cause a critical juncture, or opening, in audience members attitudes, leading them to be, temporarily, more open-minded about information that is at odds with their pre-existing attitudes. These techniques include empathy-inducing instructions [30], and priming value inconsistencies [31].

Most recently, attitude change research has investigated the effects of self-affirmation processes [32] [33]. Self-affirmation techniques are based in the notion that motivational aspects are responsible for resistance to new information, at least in part. According to Sherman & Cohen [33] " such defensive tendencies are driven, in large part, by a fundamental motivation to protect self-worth and the integrity of the self (p. 119)". Thus, when attitude are held for these reasons, persuasion techniques should begin bolstering peoples' self-worth, even in terms of another aspect of their identity. Results to date have suggested that people who have the self-worth affirmed are more open to information that is discrepant with their initial attitudes, and are more discerning. That is they are more likely to accept strong arguments that are counter their initial attitudes, and are likely to reject weak arguments that supported their initial attitude [34, in press]. Moreover, these techniques have also resulted in attitude, and in some cases, behaviour change [33].

It is important to note, however, that these techniques have been used primarily in laboratory based studies of university students. As promising as these techniques appear to be, research is now needed to determine the effectiveness of these techniques on non-university samples that possess strongly held, emotionally charged attitudes. Similarly, it is important to determine if the attitude change seen in the lab will translate into long-term attitude change in the context of military values that reject weakness, or how these techniques may be manifested in important aspects of behaviour to stigmatized individuals or groups.

Many of the factors we have discussed in previous sections of this report will also affect the information- attitude change relation, bolstering any motivational techniques used to increase the open-mindedness of the audience. Aspects of the speaker, for instance their credibility, can moderate these effects with the audience members. Thus when a speaker's credibility is high, an audience will tolerate attitudes

or positions that are more discrepant with their own, and are more likely to change their attitudes [Hovland, Harvey & Sherif, cited in 28]. Similarly when a credible speaker acknowledges and then convincingly refutes the discrepant attitudes in the audience, a greater degree of attitude change is also expected to occur.

Attitudes and behaviour

To this point we have limited our discussion to theory and research on attitudes and attitude change, as this is the aim of the OSISS Speakers Bureau Programme. However, it is also important to at least touch on the relation between attitudes and behaviours. There is a vast literature on the attitude-behaviour relation; research that has produced inconsistent results, and has been the subject of debate, over the years. However, a recent meta-analysis of this body of work [35], suggests that, in many cases attitudes are predictive of future behaviour. Person-centered factors that affect the likelihood that an attitude will predict behaviour include how certain the person believes that his or her attitude is correct, how stable the attitude is over time, and how readily accessible the attitude is. Similarly, the consistency of the attitude components (i.e., consistent beliefs, consistent beliefs and feelings), and direct experience with the attitude issue also influence the likelihood that a person's attitude will predict their behaviour. Moreover, in order to ensure a greater likelihood of behaviour change, the attitude targeted should specifically match the behaviour to be changed.

Not surprisingly there are also social level factors implicated in the attitude-behaviour relation. Specifically, people are influenced by their perceptions of how they believe high status or influential others in their group would want them to behave. Indeed these subjective norms [36] have a particular influence of public displays of behaviour. Subjective norms will play an especially important role the behaviours of people who are part of a strong social group such as a military unit. Moreover, they will be especially important to the extent that an attitude serves social acceptance, social identity and instrumental functions. These social pressures are another reason why the person presenting the persuading message must be seen as credible and be relevant to the audience. That is, the speaker should still be seen as 'one of them'. Overall then, it is important to remember that the attitude behaviour relation is influenced by multiple factors. Simply changing people's attitudes will not *automatically* result in behaviour change.

Causes of prejudiced attitudes

We have already reviewed the functions that an attitude may serve. However, any attempt to change known negative attitudes (as is largely the case regarding OSIs) should also consider the research examining the underlying causes of prejudiced attitudes. Research has identified four causes that can produce prejudicial attitudes and discriminatory behaviours [28]. We have extrapolated these findings to the case of negative attitudes toward CF personnel who have OSIs because addressing these specific concerns may provide assistance in formulating effective counterarguments.

Competition for perceived scarce resources is an important factor in the development of prejudice. For example, if soldiers believe that they have to have one hundred percent of the people in their team at one hundred percent fitness all of the time, or it

impedes their ability to do their job (and in fact could get them killed - hence the unlimited liability ties back in here), they may be likely to denigrate those people who are thought of as less than fit. In this case, the competition in this case is for the scarce resource of trained and combat capable people. Another example might be that if soldiers perceive (rightly or wrongly) that OSI sufferers receive an unfair portion of CF resources (e.g., funding from programs), they might also believe that that deprives other CF members of other valued needs (e.g., new equipment). If this belief exists, then it is more likely that prejudice will develop. Moreover, this rationalization also can be a handy excuse to justify prejudices and stereotypes concerning OSIs. Negative, prejudicial attitudes also can arise through the *displacement of frustration* onto a less advantaged group. In the present case then, soldiers who are more frustrated by certain aspects of the CF (even those unrelated to OSIs), may be more likely to also hold negative attitudes toward OSI sufferers, who become convenient targets of frustration. There are also *individual differences in the tendency to embrace prejudice and to stereotype*. Individuals who generally possess rigid beliefs, conventional values, have an intolerance of weakness, are punitive of mistakes, suspicious of others, and overly respectful of authority are called high *authoritarians*. Such individuals will show more prejudice against any disadvantaged, vulnerable group (e.g., those with OSIs). Moreover, these types of people tend to displace aggression against authority onto disadvantaged groups, especially those who have less powerful status. There is some evidence suggesting that, at least some of the men attracted to military careers have attitudes consistent with high authoritarianism [37]. Finally, a fourth way to develop and maintain prejudice is through *conformity pressures*. That is, in many cases people pick up prejudices though processes of cultural identification with esteemed members of the group to which they belong. These social norm pressures will affect conformists to a greater extent than non-conformists. Conformity can occur based on evidence, but just as often occurs even when accurate information is lacking and misleading info prevails. These social pressures to conform can lead people to adopt a negative attitude on the basis of hearsay, without any personal knowledge or experience, and maintain such attitudes even when credible evidence to the contrary is presented.

Attitudes and attitude change in the larger context

The discussion of prejudicial attitudes developing through conformity pressures, as well as our previous discussion of the social functions of attitudes brings us to a larger issue that needs consideration by the OSISS team: cultural-level attitudes within the CF regarding OSIs. Indeed, perhaps one of the biggest challenges for attitude change regarding OSIs in the Canadian Forces lies at a cultural level. Similar to any culture, militaries are ultimately sustained by an amalgam of fundamentally shared values, customs, and traditions. Perhaps the defining feature of militaries is the principle of unlimited liability. The culture that has arisen from this feature inculcates physical rigor, loyalty, obedience, discipline, courage and a willingness to accept casualties. These characteristics are assumed to be related to the ability to control, or at least mask, anxiety in the face of danger and are seen as essential for military effectiveness and success. Maintaining these characteristics has also been thought to require vigilance against any perceived softening within the ranks, a condition equated to the eroding of military readiness [38]. Thus, soldiers are often reluctant to admit that they are less than

one hundred percent, as in many military occupations it has meant being removed from duties [39] and a loss of face. It also may result in isolation from comrades and guilt arising from letting down, or even endangering, the unit. For all these reasons, signs of psychological distress in the self or in others have been considered to reflect inherent character weaknesses, especially in military units that place such a high value on fitness, toughness and courage [40].

Prejudicial attitudes are certainly maintained by overt means. Obviously, where laws, policies, and regulations enforce the exclusion or weakness of, and discrimination against, vulnerable individuals, bias and prejudice have more fertile ground to grow.

Just as importantly the overt or tacit attitudes and behaviours of commanders will undermine those cases where laws, policies, and regulations are enacted to provide rights to vulnerable groups of individuals. And indeed, it is these more subtle forms of prejudice and discrimination that will be more difficult to control and correct.

Summary & recommendations

1. Attitudes against OSIs are likely to reflect a number of attitude functions, including soldiers core beliefs concerning the CF culture of strength and toughness. These attitudes may also be complex in nature; that is people may have both positive and negative beliefs, and/or both positive and negative feelings underlying their attitudes about OSIs. These beliefs and their accompanying emotions mean that the attitudes the OSISS Speakers Bureau is setting about to change may be strong and emotionally charged.

2. It is important to understand the function, structure, and strength of the attitudes you intend to influence. Design the presentation to address these functions, to target the relevant beliefs and feelings underlying the attitude you wish to change.

3. Central processing routes of persuasion involve the quality of the arguments presented, encourage the audience to think more deeply about an issue, and generally lead to longer-term attitude change. Peripheral aspects are contextual cues unrelated to the argument quality, including aspects of the speaker: likability, credibility, similarity to the audience, professionalism, use of language (e.g., moderate speech pace, use of 'powerful phrasing')

4. To have the widest impact on the largest audience, focus on both central processing cues (i.e., the quality of arguments) and peripheral cues (i.e., the more stylistic aspects of the presentation and presenter).

5. The presentation must include evidence from a credible source (e.g., scientific publication, or unbiased organization). Presentation of evidence enhances both central and peripheral processing.

6. Personal accounts are perceived to be vivid, they tend to elicit an emotional reaction, and have been shown to produce a strong effect on people's attitudes. However, it is extremely important that the speaker is perceived as credible and legitimate.

7. In the case of OSIs, the use of two-sided messages (acknowledging and then refuting negative attitudes about OSIs) will be more likely to promote attitude change.

8. The speaker should summarize his or her arguments at the end of the communication and clearly state in the conclusion the attitude that he or she would like the audience members to adopt. This would especially be true in the case of presentations that present both sides of the issues on OSIs.

9. Presentation strategies should emphasize education and contact with speakers that mildly disconfirm prevailing attitudes about OSIs. Fear appeal and protest strategies that focus only on negative messages should be avoided.

10. Because the audience will have a large number of experienced (and thus more senior) soldiers who have deployed, it is imperative that the OSI Speakers Bureau be comprised of individuals who have equally or more credible operational experience. Personnel who do not have sufficient operational experience should not convey these messages as they can be discounted due to their lack of credibility for an audience of combat soldiers.

11. Attitudes toward military personnel with operational stress injuries are likely to be strongly held and emotionally charged. Relatively new attitude change techniques involve a two-stage process that first targets important motivational aspects of the audience prior to the presentation of information that is at odds with the initial audience attitude. These techniques include empathy-inducing instructions, priming of value inconsistencies relevant to the attitude to be changed and self-affirmation techniques. Although the research results are quite encouraging, note that careful research needs to be conducted to determine the effectiveness of such techniques in the context of military personnel, and the effectiveness of the techniques with respect to longer term attitude change, as well as behavior change.

12. The relation between attitudes and behaviour involves multiple factors. Particularly relevant in the present context is the influence of subjective norms, that is soldiers perceptions about how they think valued other in their social group want them to behave. Simply changing people's attitudes will not *automatically* result in behaviour change.

13. Long-term attitude change must be considered in the context of the CF culture. Thus, attitudes toward OSIs will have to be reconciled with central core values of toughness and fitness within the CF.

14. Given the strong influence of social factor and group factors in a military culture, the efforts of the OSISS Speakers Bureau must be presented in the context of an integrated approach to OSI attitude and behaviour change. Policies should be designed with zero tolerance for overt prejudice and stereotypes. Just as importantly, the tacit attitudes and behaviours of CF commander structures must support OSI attitude and behaviour change.

References

1. Perloff, R. (2003). The dynamics of persuasion: Communication and attitudes in the 21st Century. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

2. Allport, G. W. (1935). Attitudes. In C. Murchinson (Ed.), Handbook of Social Psychology (pp. 798-844). Worchester, MA: Clark University Press.

3. Katz, D. (1960). The functional approach to the study of attitudes. Public Opinion Quarterly, 24, 163-204.

4. Smith, M. B., Bruner, J. S., & White, R. W. (1956). Opinions and personality. New York: Wiley.

5. Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). Belief, attitude, intention, and behaviour: An introduction to theory and research. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

6. Thompson, M.M., Zanna, M.P., & Griffin, D.W. (1995). Let's not be indifferent about (attitudinal) ambivalence. In R.E. Petty & J.A. Krosnick (Eds.), Attitude strength: Antecedents and consequences (pp. 361-386). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

7. Armitage, C. J., & Conner, M. (2000). Attitudinal ambivalence: A test of three key hypotheses. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26, 1421-1432.

8. Lavine, H., Thomsen, C. J., Zanna, M. P., & Borgida, E. (1998). On nthe primacy of affect in the determination of attitudes and behavior: The moderating role of affective-cognitive ambivalence. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 34, 398-421.

9. Krosnick, J.A., & Petty, R.E. (1995). Attitude strength: An overview. In R.E. Petty & J.A. Krosnick (Eds.), Attitude strength: Antecedents and consequences (pp. 1-24). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

10. Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986). The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (vol. 19, pp. 123-205). NY: Academic Press.

11. Petty, R.E., & Wegener, D.T. (1999). The Elaboration Likelihood Model: Current status and controversies. In S. Chaiken & Y. Trope (Eds.), Dual process theories in social psychology (pp. 41-72). New York: Guilford Press.

12. Eagly, A.H., & Chaiken, S. (1993). The psychology of attitudes. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

13. Petty, R.E., Wegener, D.T., & Fabrigar, L.R. (1997). Attitudes and attitude change. Annual Review of Psychology, 48, 609-647.

14. Olson, J.M., & Zanna, M.P. (1993). Attitudes and attitude change. Annual Review of Psychology, 44, 117-154.

15. Allen, M. (1998). Comparing the persuasive effectiveness of one and two-sided messages. In M. Allen and R. W. Preiss (Eds.), Persuasion: Advances through meta-analysis (pp. 87-98). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

16. O'Keefe, D. J. (1999). How to handle opposing arguments in persuasive messages. A meta-analytic review of the effects of one-sided and two-sided messages. In ME Roloff (Ed.), Communication Yearbook, 22, 209-249.

17. McGuire, W.J. (1969). The nature of attitudes and attitude change. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), Handbook of social psychology (2nd ed., Vol.3, pp. 136-314). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

18. Reynolds, R. A., & Reynolds, J. L. (2002). Evidence. In J. E. Dillard and M. Pfare (eds.), The persuasion handbook: Developments in theory and practice (pp. 427-444). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

19. Taylor, S. E., & Thompson, S. C. (1982). Stalking the elusive "vividness" effect. Psychological review, 89, 155-181.

20. Boster, F. J., & Mongeau, P. (1984). Fear-arousing persuasive messages. In R. N. Bostrom (Ed.), Communication Yearbook, 8, 330-375.

21. Rothman, A.J., & Salovey, P. (1997). Shaping perceptions to motivate healthy behaviour: The role of message framing. Psychological Bulletin, 121, 3-19.

22. Apanovitch, A.M., McCarthy, D., & Salovey, P. (2003). Using message framing to motivate HIV testing among low income, ethnic minority women. Health Psychology, 22, 60-67.

23. Smith, S. M. & Schaffer, D. R. (1995). Speed of speech and persuasion: Evidence for multiple effects. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21, 1051-1060.

24. Burrell, N., A., & Koper, R. J. (1998). The efficacy of powerful/powerless language on attitudes and source credibility. In M. Allen & R. W. Preiss (Eds.), Persuasion: Advances through meta-analysis (pp. 203-215). Creskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

25. Corrigan, P. W., River, L. P., Lundin, R. K., Penn, D. L., Uphoff-Wasowski, K., Camion, J., Mathison, J., Gagnon, C., Bergman, M., Goldstein, H., & Kubiak, M. A. (2001). Three strategies for changing attributions about severe mental illness. Schizophrenia Bulletin, 27, 187-195.

26. Petty, R.E., Wheeler, C., & Tormala, Z.L. (2003). Persuasion and attitude change. In T. Millon & M.J. Lerner (Eds.), Handbook of psychology: Personality and social psychology (Vol. 5, pp. 353-382). New York: John Wiley and Sons.

27. Cacioppo, J. T. & Petty, R. E. (1982). The need for cognition. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42, 116-131.

28. Aronson, E. (1984). The Social Animal. New York: Freeman & Co.

29. Eagly, A. H. & Chaiken, S. L. (1995). Attitude strengtyh, attitude structure and resistance to change. In R. E. Petty, & Krosnick, J. A. (Eds.), Attitude strength: Antecedents and consequences. Ohio State University series on attitudes and persuasion (pp. 413-432). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

30. Finlay K. A. & Stephan, W. G. (2000). Improving intergroup relations: The effects of empathy on racial attitudes. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 30, 1720-1737.

31. Dovidio , J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (1999). Reducing prejudice: Combating intergroup biases. Current Directions in Psychological Science, 8, 101-105.

32. Cohen, G. L., Aronson, J., & Steele, C. M. (2000). When beliefs yield to evidence: Reducing biased evaluations by affirming the self. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26, 1151-1164.

33. Sherman, D. K., & Cohen G. L. (2002). Accepting threatening information: Self-affirmation and the reduction of defensive biases. Current Directions in Psychological Science. 11, 119-123.

34. Correll, J., Spencer, S. J., & Zanna, M. P. (in press). An affirmed self and an open mind:Self-affirmation and sensitivity to attitude strength. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology.

35. Kraus, S. (1995). Attitudes and the prediction of behavior: A meta-analysis of the empirical literature. Personality & Social Bulletin, 21(1), 58-75.

36. Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1980). Understanding attitudes and predicting social behaviour. Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice Hall.

37. Robinson-Kurpius, S. E., & Lucart, A. L. (2000). Military and civilian undergraduates: Attitudes toward women, masculinity, and authoritarianism. Sex Roles, 43, 255-265.

38. Ulmer, W.F., Collins, J.J., & Jacobs, T.O. (2000). American Military Culture in the 21st century: A report of the CSIS International Security program. Washington, D.C.: The Center for Strategic and International Studies Press.

39. Budd, F. (1997). Helping the helpers after the bombing in Dhahran: Critical incident stress services for an air rescue squadron. Military Medicine, 162, 515-520.

40. Noy, S. (1991). Combat Stress Reactions. In R. Gal and A.D. Mangelsdorff (Eds.), The Handbook of Military Psychology (pp. 507-530). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA SHEET

1a. PERFORMING AGENCY DRDC Toronto	2. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED Unlimited distribution -
1b. PUBLISHING AGENCY DRDC Toronto	

3. TITLE

(U) Attitudes and Attitude Change: Implications for the OSSIS Speakers Bureau Programme

4. AUTHORS

Megan M. Thompson, Donald R. McCreary

5. DATE OF PUBLICATION	6. NO. OF PAGES
September 16 , 2003	31

7. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES

8. SPONSORING/MONITORING/CONTRACTING/TASKING AGENCY
Sponsoring Agency:
Monitoring Agency:
Contracting Agency :
Tasking Agency:

9. ORIGINATORS DOCUMENT NO.	10. CONTRACT GRANT AND/OR PROJECT NO.	11. OTHER DOCUMENT NOS.
Technical Memorandum TM 2003-126		

12. DOCUMENT RELEASABILITY

Unlimited distribution

13. DOCUMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

Unlimited announcement

14. ABSTRACT

(U) The Operational Stress Injury Social Support (OSISS) project is developing a Speakers Bureau in order to educate and increase awareness of occupational stress injuries (OSIs) Specifically, the Speakers Bureau will be a cadre of respected CF members, trained to speak to small groups of CF personnel about their own experience of OSIs. By combining scientific information and data with personal accounts of their own OSIs, it is hoped that these speakers will put a more human or personal face on operational stress injuries, thus reducing the stigma of these occupationally-related mental health problems. The ultimate goal of the OSISS Speakers Bureau is to provide education in the larger CF community in order to foster understanding and acceptance of operational stress injuries (OSIs). In order to assist OSISS in this endeavor, this report reviews the main theories and key research findings from the attitude and attitude change literature. We provide applications of key concepts to OSIs, and OSI-related attitude change, thereby linking theory and research to this important area. We also discuss the attitude-behavior relation, as well as major factors that can facilitate or obstruct sustained attitude change in general, and with respect to mental health issues more specifically. We then place attitudes and attitude change within the larger cultural context of the CF. We conclude by summarizing key findings and providing recommendations to guide the OSISS program's development of a Speakers Bureau.

(U) Le projet Soutien social aux victimes de stress opérationnel (SSVSO) est en train de mettre sur pied un bureau des conférenciers qui sera chargé d'éduquer et de sensibiliser les militaires aux traumatismes liés au stress opérationnel (TSO). Plus précisément, le bureau des conférenciers sera composé de membres respectés des FC, formés pour parler devant de petits groupes de militaires canadiens concernant leur expérience des TSO. En combinant l'information et les données scientifiques avec les récits personnels de TSO, nous espérons que ces conférenciers traceront un portrait plus humain ou personnel des traumatismes liés au stress opérationnel, en vue de réduire la honte associée à ce type de problèmes de santé mentale d'origine professionnelle. L'objectif ultime du bureau des conférenciers du SSVSO est d'informer la communauté plus large des FC afin qu'elle comprenne et accepte mieux les traumatismes liés au stress opérationnel (TSO). Dans le but d'aider le projet SSVSO dans cette entreprise, nous passons en revue dans le présent rapport les principales théories et 6. Keywords, descriptors or identifiersEnter words or phrases separated by semi-colons. 7. Contributing agencies and roles When the contributing agency is part of DRDC, choose the appropriate entry in 'Corporate Body' column; otherwise leave column blank and econclusions de recherche tirées des études publiées sur l'attitude et le changement d'attitude. Nous appliquons les concepts clés aux TSO et au changement d'attitude à l'égard des TSO, établissant ainsi un lien entre la théorie et la recherche dans cet important domaine. Nous discutons également de la relation attitude?comportement de même que des principaux facteurs qui peuvent faciliter ou entraver un changement durable d'attitude en général et d'attitude face aux problèmes de santé mentale en particulier. Nous replaçons ensuite les attitudes et le changement d'attitude dans le contexte culturel plus large des FC. Nous concluons en résumant les principales observations et formulons des recommandations pour orienter la mise sur pied du bureau des conférenciers par le programme de SSVSO.

15. KEYWORDS, DESCRIPTORS or IDENTIFIERS

(U) Operational Stress Injury Support (OSISS), attitude change, Elaboration Likelihood Model